SM

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/298,603	04/23/1999	BORIS KLOTS	50277210	2232

29989 7590 02/28/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER	
VU, THONG H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	13

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/298,603	Applicant(s) KLOTS ET AL.	
	Examiner Thong H Vu	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-9,16-23,25-28 and 30-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1. This office action is in response to Amendment filed 12/31/02. Claims 5,10-15,24 and 29 are canceled. Amended claims 1,16,20 and new claims 30-32 are pending. The rejection is cited as stated below.

2. Claims 1-4,6-9,16-23,25-28,30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Zuili et al [Zuili 6,145,084] and the obviousness in the art.

3. As per claims 1,16,20,30-32 Zuili discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a system and method for processing data on a distributed computing system that includes a plurality of nodes (i.e.:client-server) [Fig 1-4]

a director (i.e.: a database) being configured to maintain mapping data (i.e.:protocol conversion, language translation) that specifies work that can be performed by each of plurality nodes [col 4 line 43- col 5 line 2].

in response to receiving a first work request to perform first work from a first process on a first node (i.e.: device A) from the plurality of nodes, determining based upon the first work and mapping data (i.e.: request information), that the first work is to be performed on a second node (i.e.: verification server) from the plurality of nodes; providing the first work request to a second process on the second node, wherein the first work request specifies that the first process is to directly receive result of the first work [col 7 line 1-16, col 8 lines 26-34];

determining based upon the first work and the mapping data, that the first work is also to be performed on a third node (i.e.: device B) from the plurality of node; and

Zuili also taught the source node (device A) and destination node (device B) directly communicated [Fig 1]; providing a second work request to a third process on the

third node, wherein the second work request specifies that results of the first work performed on the third node are to be provide directly to the first process [col 8 lines 46-67].

Zuili does not explicitly detail the request including mapping data or request specified the result of work performed on N node. It is obvious that a skilled artisan would modified the request to implement the directly communication between the source node and the destination node.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the client/server system wherein the verification server verified the client A and client B then client A and client B established the direct communication (i.e.: send and receive). Doing so would provide a quick and simple process to communication on network.

4. As per claims 2,21 Zuili discloses including the steps of in response to receiving a second request to perform second work from the first process, determining that the second work is to be performed on a third node from the plurality of nodes, and providing the second request to a third process on the third node, wherein the second request specifies that the first process is to receive results of the second work directly from the third process as inherent feature of directly response.

5. As per claims 3,22 Zuili discloses including the steps of in response to receiving a second request to perform second work from a third process on a third node from the plurality of nodes, determining based upon the second work and the mapping data, that the second work is to be performed on the second node, and providing the second

request to the second process, wherein the second request specifies that the third process is to receive results of the second work directly from the second process as inherent feature of directly response.

6. As per claims 4,23 Zuili discloses including the steps of in response to receiving a second request to perform second work from a third process on a third node from the plurality of nodes, determining based upon the second work and the mapping data, a fourth node from the plurality of nodes on which the second work is to be performed, and providing the second request to a fourth process on the fourth node, wherein the second request specifies that the third process is to receive results of the second work directly from the fourth as inherent feature of mapping data and directly response.

7. As per claims 6,25 Zuili discloses the step of determining that the first work is to be performed on a second node includes the step of determining one or more resources required to perform the first work, and determining which of the plurality of nodes is allowed to perform the first work on the one or more resources as inherent feature of mapping data and directly response.

8. As per claims 7,26 Zuili discloses the step of determining that the first work is to be performed on a second node from the plurality of nodes includes the step of a director determining that the first work is to be performed on a second node from the plurality of nodes, and the step of providing the first work request to a second process on the second node includes the step of the director providing the first work request to a second process on the second node as inherent feature of directly response.

9. As per claims 8,27 Zuili discloses the step of upon completion of the first work, the second process providing the results of the first work directly to the first process as inherent feature of directly response.

10. As per claims 9,28 Zuili discloses the first work request is a remote procedure call as inherent feature of directly response.

11. As per claim 17, Zuili discloses the director is further configured to provide the first work request to the second process as inherent feature of directly response.

12. As per claim 18, Zuili discloses the director is further configured to generate a second work request to requests that the second process perform the first work and provide the first results directly to the first process, and provide the second work request to the second process as inherent feature of directly response.

13. As per claim 19, Zuili discloses resource data that specifies the access rights of the plurality of nodes relative to resources as inherent feature of remote procedure call as inherent feature of directly response.

14. Claims 1-4,6-9,16-23,25-28,30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 [e] as being anticipated by Chessell [6,324,589]

15. As per claims 1,16,20,30-32 Chessell discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a system and method for processing data on a distributed computing system that includes a plurality of nodes (i.e.:client-server)

a director (i.e.: object) being configured to maintain mapping data that specifies work that can be performed by each of plurality nodes.

in response to receiving a first work request to perform first work from a first process on a first node from the plurality of nodes, determining based upon the first work and mapping data, that the first work is to be performed on a second node from the plurality of nodes;

providing the first work request to a second process on the second node, wherein the first work request specifies that the first process is to directly receive result of the first work;

determining based upon the first work and the mapping data, that the first work is also to be performed on a third node from the plurality of node; and

providing the second work request to a third process on the third node, wherein the second work request specifies that results of the first work performed on the third node are to be provide directly to the first process.

It is equivalent to a server for use in a client/server computing system for processing a transaction, the client/server computing system being of at least a three-tier process type, where a first tier process initiates the transaction and contacts a second tier process to further the transaction which in turn contacts a third tier process which contains local data to be updated in the transaction, the server, which runs the second tier process, has a means for receiving a transaction context from the first tier process requesting that the second tier process be registered in the transaction; and a means for passing on the transaction context to the third tier process informing the third tier process that it should register itself into the transaction directly with the first tier

process without going through the second tier process. This greatly reduces the required number of cross-process flows.

16. As per claims 2,21 Chessell discloses including the steps of in response to receiving a second request to perform second work from the first process, determining that the second work is to be performed on a third node from the plurality of nodes, and providing the second request to a third process on the third node, wherein the second request specifies that the first process is to receive results of the second work directly from the third process as inherent feature of cross-process.

17. As per claims 3,22 Chessell discloses including the steps of in response to receiving a second request to perform second work from a third process on a third node from the plurality of nodes, determining based upon the second work and the mapping data, that the second work is to be performed on the second node, and providing the second request to the second process, wherein the second request specifies that the third process is to receive results of the second work directly from the second process as inherent feature of cross-process.

18. As per claims 4,23 Chessell discloses including the steps of in response to receiving a second request to perform second work from a third process on a third node from the plurality of nodes, determining based upon the second work and the mapping data, a fourth node from the plurality of nodes on which the second work is to be performed, and providing the second request to a fourth process on the fourth node, wherein the second request specifies that the third process is to receive results of the second work directly from the fourth as inherent feature of cross-process.

19. As per claims 6,25 Chessell discloses the step of determining that the first work is to be performed on a second node includes the step of determining one or more resources required to perform the first work, and determining which of the plurality of nodes is allowed to perform the first work on the one or more resources as inherent feature of cross-process.

20. As per claims 7,26 Chessell discloses the step of determining that the first work is to be performed on a second node from the plurality of nodes includes the step of a director determining that the first work is to be performed on a second node from the plurality of nodes, and the step of providing the first work request to a second process on the second node includes the step of the director providing the first work request to a second process on the second node as inherent feature of cross-process.

21. As per claims 8,27 Chessell discloses the step of upon completion of the first work, the second process providing the results of the first work directly to the first process as inherent feature of cross-process.

22. As per claims 9,28 Chessell discloses the first work request is a remote procedure call as inherent feature of cross-process.

23. As per claim 17, Chessell discloses the director is further configured to provide the first work request to the second process as inherent feature of cross-process.

24. As per claim 18, Chessell discloses the director is further configured to generate a second work request to requests that the second process perform the first work and provide the first results directly to the first process, and provide the second work request to the second process as inherent feature of cross-process.

25. As per claim 19, Chessell discloses resource data that specifies the access rights of the plurality of nodes relative to resources as inherent feature of remote procedure call as inherent feature of cross-process.

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Mark Powell*, can be reached at (703) 305-9703.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final	(703) 746-7238
Official:	(703) 746-7239
Non-Official	(703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

MARK POWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100